

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented herein.

The claims in the application are claims 20 to 32, all other claims having been cancelled. Claim 22 has been amended to correct the typographical error therein.

Claims 20 to 28 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner was of the opinion that claims 20 and 25 were indefinite in the phrase "starch synthase GBSSI of *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii* in the form of preprotein of 708 amino acids" and this was not clear to the Examiner. The claims were deemed to be indefinite in the use of the expression "corresponding to" as well as being indefinite in the use of the term "fragment". The Examiner also objected to the phrase "wherein the peptide or polypeptide is selected from" and the use of the term "especially" was objected to. The Examiner suggested replacing the term "contains" with the term "comprising".


Applicants respectfully traverse these grounds of rejection since it is deemed that the claims as amended properly comply with 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The term "corresponding" has been changed to "comprising" and the reference to "fragments" has been deleted from the claims. The claims are now believed to comply with 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The term "especially" has been deleted from the claims and the term

"contains" has been changed to "comprises". The expression "preprotein of 708 amino acids" has been deleted from the claims as well as other terminology objected to by the Examiner as being indefinite. Therefore, the amended claims are believed to properly define the invention and withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested.

Claims 20 to 28 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as being not based upon an enabling disclosure due to the use of the term "fragment" which is no longer in the present claims and therefore, it is believed that the claims are directed to properly enabled sequence ID numbers which have been specifically recited in the claims. Therefore, withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the lack of any pertinent prior art, it is believed that the claims no clearly point out Applicants' patentable contribution and favorable reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Muserlian, Lucas and Mercanti



Charles A. Muserlian, 19,683
Attorney for Applicants
Tel.# (212) 661-8000

CAM:ds
Enclosure